

même espèce, ce qui n'a pas encore été fait; car on ne voit pas la raison de réunir ces deux noms, si *variegatus* est une espèce différente d'*audax*, comme cela a été envisagé jusqu'ici.

Je conseillerai donc les auteurs américains de continuer à appeler *Phidippus audax* cette espèce qu'ils connaissent bien, et ce n'est que plus tard, surtout si l'on ne trouve plus de *variegatus*, que l'on réunira les deux noms en faisant adopter celui d'*audax* comme étant le plus connu et ne donnant lieu à aucune confusion.

#### THE CASE OF *PSOIDOS*, *PSODOS* OR *PSOLOS* TREITSCHKE.

Z.N.(S.) 362

(see volume 27, pages 101-102)

By George C. Steyskal (*Systematic Entomology Laboratory, Agricultural Research Service, USDA, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*)

This case is somewhat complicated by the citation in the great unabridged Liddell and Scott Greek lexicon of "*psiothos*, ho, v. *psiothos* 2." Under *psiothos* 2. we find "2. = *psolos*, also written *psiothos*, akin to *spodos*, Gramm.: hence adj. *psiothios*, a, on, = *psoloeis*. (From *psolos* by a dialectic change, like Lat. *lacryma* from *dakryon*, etc.)." The Greek has been transliterated and the irrelevant accents omitted for the sake of clarity and simplicity. It would appear from this that what Treitschke originally intended may have been *psiothos*, especially since theta in old German lexica looks exactly like a German script d.

It should be noted that the author's name is Treitschke, not Treitsche.

Because, as Cowan stated, "there are no grounds for considering it worthy of emendation under Article 32 and it cannot be rejected as inappropriate under Article 18a" and inasmuch as the two forms *Psoidos* and *psodos* are so similar, I believe that the relatively long usage of the latter form would not override the codical requirements and the original form *Psoidos* should be used. My colleagues in Lepidoptera assure me that the species of this genus are rather obscure, high-altitude forms of no economic importance.

By D. S. Fletcher, A. Watson & I. W. B. Nye (*British Museum (Natural History)*, London)

We wish to lend our whole hearted support to Mr. C. Cowan's plea for the validation of the emendation *Psodos* of the generic name *Psoidos* Treitschke, 1825. The name *Psodos* has been widely used and is in current use in European and Asiatic entomological literature.

A decision is especially important in view of the Commission's declared, but unfulfilled intention to publish an Opinion to validate Berthet's emendation *Psolos* and place it on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology.

#### THE IDENTITY OF *PHALAEANA TINEA XYLOSTELLA* LINNAEUS, 1758 (INSECTA, LEPIDOPTERA). Z.N.(S.) 1906

By J. D. Bradley (*Commonwealth Institute of Entomology, London*) and W. H. T. Tams (*Curator of the Linnaean Zoological Collections, London*)

The proposal by Wolff (1970 : 60) that a neotype should be designated for *Phalaena Tinea xylostella* Linnaeus, despite the existence of a lectotype, selected by Bradley (1966 : 219) from syntypic material preserved in the Linnaean collection, does not take into account certain facts of primary importance concerning the true identity of this species. In an attempt to achieve the desired objective of the proposal it appears that greater significance is attached to the suitability of the specific epithet in relation to the foodplant, rather than to the original description of the adult and the extant Linnaean specimen(s). Consequently the proposal advocates application of the name to a species which clearly does not fit the original description.

2. Wolff applies the species-group name *xylostella* to the *Lonicera*-feeding species known as *Ypsolophus dentella* (Fabricius, 1775) (= *harpella* Denis & Schiffermüller, 1775), and not, as we contend is correct, to the Roesel's Crucifer-feeding species (1746, Cl. 4 : 22–23, pl. 10), which is known in the literature as *Plutella xylostella* (Linnaeus) (= *maculipennis* Curtis, 1832; *cruciferarum* Zeller, 1843) and commonly referred to as the Diamond-back moth. To qualify this usage Wolff finds it necessary to assume—incorrectly as it proves—that Linnaeus made an “unfortunate” mistake in the original description concerning the size of *xylostella*; also, Wolff fails to take fully into account the description of the adult.

3. The use of the name *xylostella* for the *Lonicera*-feeder on the basis of Wolff's proposal requires: (a) acceptance of the “assumption” that Linnaeus made a mistake in the size when describing the species—which is not sustained by the facts; (b) that the foodplant is more decisive in determining the species—which is hardly acceptable since Linnaeus cites *Fauna Svecica* (1746 : 279) in which, as Wolff admits, the species described is indubitably the Crucifer-feeder and the foodplants given are “*Hortis oleraceis*”; (c) treatment of the actual description as being of secondary importance—which would be contrary to normal practice; (d) rejection of the lectotype as spurious—though there is no proof that this specimen, labelled “*Xylostella*” in the Linnaean collection and agreeing with the original description, is other than authentic.

4. The identity of *Phalaena Tinea xylostella* Linnaeus (1758 : 538) should rest primarily on the original description, which is as follows:

“... *alis cinereis* : *vitta dorsali communi alba dentata*.

*Fn. Svec.* 909.

*Habitat in Lonicera.*

*Simillima* Roes. *ins.* : *phal.* 4 t. 10. in *Brassica, Lactuca, sed minor.*”

The above description can apply only to the Diamond-back moth, the words “*alis cinereis*” describing precisely the coloration of the forewings; those of the *Lonicera*-feeder are deep ochreous-brown. The words “*vitta dorsali communi alba dentata*” clearly describe the forewing dorsal streak of the Diamond-back; the *Lonicera*-feeder has a pale yellow dorsal streak which is only slightly sinuate and not dentate.

Of significance is the difference in wing shape between the Diamond-back and the *Lonicera*-feeder. In this respect the Diamond-back has elongate-ovate forewings (Pl. 1, fig. 1), while those of the *Lonicera*-feeder (Pl. 1, fig. 2) are strongly falcate, similar to those of the closely related species *Phalaena Tinea nemorella* Linnaeus, 1758 (Pl. 1, fig. 3). The difference in wing shape becomes especially significant when the original descriptions of these two species are compared and the fact that Linnaeus placed *xylostella* two pages after *nemorella* and immediately following *Phalaena Tinea vittella* Linnaeus, 1758 (Pl. 1, fig. 4) which the Diamond-back closely resembles superficially. Linnaeus describes the forewings of *nemorella* as “*alis albidis incurvalis*” and it is unlikely that the equally falcate forewings of the *Lonicera*-feeder would not have been similarly described had he that species before him when describing *xylostella*.

It is thus evident that the original description of the adult of *xylostella* does not apply to the *Lonicera*-feeder, and the contention by Wolff that Linnaeus “appeared” to be well aware of the existence of two “very similar” species differing in size and feeding on different foodplants is surely open to doubt. We submit that Wolff's statement that “The ‘lectotype’ has, therefore, been chosen in contradiction to the written text by Linnaeus” cannot be accepted.

The apparent discrepancy in size referred to by Wolff is also not borne out by Linnaeus's observation “*Simillima... sed minor*”. On the contrary, Linnaeus, when comparing *xylostella* with Roesel's Crucifer-feeder, the Diamond-back moth, was quite correct in using those words (similar... but smaller). The Linnaean specimen designated as lectotype has a wing expanse of 12–13 mm., while the life-size figure of the Diamond-back in Roesel measures 15 mm. The range of wing-span in the Diamond-back moth is 11–16 mm., which is compatible with Linnaeus's observation on size, as against 17–22 mm. in the *Lonicera*-feeder.

5. Recourse to the early literature shows an overwhelming unanimity in the application of the name *xylostella* by 18th and 19th century authors, including Schrank

